REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-19 remain in the application. Claims 1 and 12 are amended to more distinctly describe the subject matter of applicants' invention. Support for these amendments is found at least on page 7, lines 13-27. Claim 19 is amended to better distinguish the claimed invention. Support for this amendment is found at page 7, lines 28-30 among other locations. No new matter is added by this response.

A. Information Disclosure Statement.

Copies of the four non-patent references listed in the Information Disclosure statement filed July 26, 2002 are enclosed herewith. It is respectfully believed that the references were supplied with the IDS as called for in 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2) and that the references should be considered submitted on July 26, 2002.

B. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102.

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 based upon San Andres et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1, as amended, calls for means coupled to the gateway machine for selecting amongst servers of redundant resources a particular server for a received request so as to <u>balance load across the plurality of communication channels</u>. Independent claim 12 calls for a method that includes causing the gateway machine to select amongst servers <u>so as to balance load across the plurality of communication channels</u>. At least these features of claims 1 and 12 are not shown or suggested in the San Andres reference.

San Andres shows a transaction replication system in which client requests are directed to a plurality of gateways which, in turn, communicate with application servers over a LAN (or multiple LANs). However, San Andres does not show or suggest balancing load across multiple channels or multiple LANs. It should be noted that this feature was originally presented in claim 2 and the

6

office action fails to point out where in the reference the feature is shown or suggested.

For at least these reasons claims 1 and 12 are allowable over the San Andres reference. Claims 2-11 and 13-18 that depend from claims 1 and 12 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 12.

Claim 19 calls for an intermediary server receiving requests for server access from a plurality of sources, wherein the intermediary server is in a separate address domain from the network connected server. San Andres is silent with respect this feature and so does not show or suggest claim 19.

C. Conclusion.

In view of all of the above, claims 1-19 are believed to be allowable and the case in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

This response is filed together with a request for a 3 month extension of time to respond and the required fee of $475 as determined on the accompanying fee transmittal. Any fee deficiency associated with this submittal may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

April 12, 2004

Stuart T. Langley, Reg. No. 33,940
Hogan & Hartson LLP
One Tabor Center
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, Colorado 80202
(720) 406-5335 Tel
(303) 899-7333 Fax

7